



DIVISION OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

Little Rock School District Exit Plan

Mid-Year Report

Submitted by: Stacy Smith, Deputy Commissioner

The Little Rock School District continues to make progress on exit criteria established after reconstitution of the District. The updated criteria allows the District to demonstrate to DESE, the State Board, the newly elected LRSD board, and community that LRSD is poised for the present and future academic success of its students.

The approach taken in this exit plan continues to focus on developing coherence within and among the District and schools, so that together teachers and administrators establish a new baseline understanding of high-quality instructional approaches and curriculum expectations. As schools demonstrate the ability to provide a high-quality program of instruction that serves all students well, the continuous improvement will shift from primarily district-orchestrated decision making to greater school level empowerment and accountability. This work will be led by the District administrative team and supported by DESE as needed. This exit plan will be the basis for identifying the foundational criteria for exit of Level 5 support. The artifacts of each lagging indicator will be identified in consultation with the District and applicable resource. The artifacts will be reviewed during the mid-year and end-of-year timeframes in order to allow the district to exit from Level 5 Support in a timely manner. This exit plan and artifacts will be made public.

The 4 main areas of focus in the plan are derived from the High Reliability School Framework and are a continuation of current work. The areas are as follows:

- Collaborative teams regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students.
- The school provides teachers with clear, ongoing evaluations of their pedagogical strengths and weaknesses that are based on multiple sources of data and are consistent with student achievement data.
- The school literacy curriculum and accompanying assessments adhere to state and district standards.
- The school manages its fiscal, operational, and technological resources in a way that directly supports teachers to provide a safe, supportive and collaborative culture and increase student achievement.

Rating Scale: The following rating scale was established to assist in communicating and determining progress for each area of criteria and objectives established. A score of a 3 or better would be satisfactory.

- 4- Met - The District has met the expectation of the objective or criteria independently
- 3- Making Adequate Progress - The District has made significant progress on the objective or criteria
- 2- Partially Met- The District has met some of the objective criteria, but not at an adequate level
- 1- Not Met- The District is not on track to meet the objective without significant action given towards the objective or criteria.

Criteria 1: The District will Implement PLC Processes and HRS Levels 1, 2 and 3 Evidence Folder		
Artifacts: LRSB District Leadership will monitor implementation through Focus Walks, Instructional Rounds and during Level Meetings.	Presentation Date	Responsible Party
Evidence- Beginning of the Year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● HRS/PLC Implementation and Sustainability Plan MET/4 ● Master schedules that provide time for collaborative teams to meet weekly MET/4 ● Stakeholder perceptual data ● Guiding Coalitions identified MET/4 	District Leadership Team: March 2020 DESE: May 2020 PPC: June 2020 CAB: February 2020 LRSB Board Ratification: December 2020 (Work Session)	Lead: Randy Rutherford, Darian Smith Support: Jeremy Owoh, Hope Worsham
Evidence- Mid-Year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Collective Commitments established/articulated/agreed on MET/4 ● Common Meeting Norms adopted and followed for all meetings Making Adequate Progress/3 ● Four critical questions are focus of meetings and agenda items Making Adequate Progress/3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>What do we want students to learn?</i> (curriculum) ○ <i>How do we know if students are learning?</i> (assessment) ○ <i>How will we respond when students don't learn?</i> (intervention) ○ <i>How will we extend learning for students who are already proficient?</i> (extension) 	Due to DESE by December 1, 2020	Resource: Solution Tree Marzano Resources

Evidence-End-of-Year:

- Development of essential standards identified for literacy and math
- Process of identifying learning targets/proficiency scales has begun
- Mission and/or Vision Document that indicates a focus on learning at high levels for all students
- School goals are focused on learning
- Leadership teams with process for including teacher input; examples of decisions that teachers helped to make around school improvement;
- Feedback loops created to allow for authentic stakeholder input

OCSS Comments: There is sufficient evidence that the District has embraced the professional learning communities model and has established foundational expectations, as well as support systems for various buildings who are at different stages of implementation. The District leadership team has modeled the expectation of functioning within the parameters by setting collective commitments and norms. When interviewing executive directors for mid-year reports, comments centered around the “common language” and “guiding coalitions” within the District and notable progress of specific schools. Some schools began the professional learning process on their own several years ago and are further along, the past two years the state has supported several school teams with PLCs. However, it’s important to note that the District, on its own, has intentionally planned professional learning for all schools around the Professional Learning Communities model and High Reliability School model. The District also invested in building leadership capacity by providing PLC professional development to all assistant principals and principals.

The District provided evidence of collaborative teaming, norms, collective commitments, and agendas for all schools within the District.

Total Mid-Year Points for Criteria One: 3.6- Satisfactory

Next steps: The district needs to continue promoting and supporting the implementation of the PLC model. While the foundational elements of PLCs have been established within the district, the real work comes in the authentic collaboration between educators about essential standards, common formative assessments, student data, instructional practices, etc. Administrators and classroom teachers will continue to need support to move from a PLC structure to a model of functioning as a collaborative professional learning community.

Criteria 2: The District will implement TESS and LEADS systems. Evidence Folder		
Artifacts: Data from Focus Walks, Instructional Rounds and <i>EdReflect Insight Reports</i> .	Presentation Date	Responsible Party
Evidence-Beginning-of-Year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TESS and LEADs Guidance Document MET/4 • TESS/EdReflect Recalibration for Administration MET/4 • TESS/EdReflect recalibration training provided to certified staff by principal or designee MET/4 • TESS/EdReflect training for novice teachers and included in onboarding plan MET/4 • Updated TESS 4-Year Rotation Cycle for current year (COVID-adjusted) • PGP are updated/developed in EdReflect MET/4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Closed by October 1st • “Additional Artifacts” is open for documentation of PGP progress MET/4 	District Leadership Team: January 2020/July 2020 DESE: May 2020 PPC: August 2020 CAB: August 2020 LRSD Board Ratification: December 2020 (Work Session)	Lead: Randy Rutherford, Darian Smith Support: Jeremy Owoh, Rocci Malone, Brent Miller, Hope Worsham, Building Principals
Evidence-Mid-Year: * Focus Walks in place of EdReflect <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of 8 weekly informal observations per building administrator as evidenced by <i>EdReflect Insight Reports Making Adequate Progress/3</i> • Evidence of quality feedback from observations of principal/teacher interactions or documentation from Ed Reflect <i>Making Adequate Progress/3</i> • Evidence of PGP updates between building administration and certified staff members MET/4 	Due to DESE by December 1, 2020	Resource: Bloomboard
Evidence-End-Year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of 8 weekly informal observations per building administrator • Evidence of quality feedback from observations of principal/teacher interactions or documentation from Ed Reflect Career Summative • Evaluations completed and data reviewed with administrators making decisions regarding employment, assignment, and support for teachers based on data. 	Due to DESE by June 1, 2021	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of PGP review between building administration and certified staff members on the non-career summative track 		
--	--	--

OCSS Comments: This is the fourth year for the District to have utilized the TESS and LEADS framework within the District. The District has implemented and completed all professional development for this school year pertaining to the framework and supports around TESS. The District has implemented an expectation of a minimum of 8 weekly informal observations per building administrator providing quality feedback. District level administrators are routinely checking EdReflect and following up with building level administrators on their observations. During interviews, the conversations centered on improving the quality of feedback for teachers. This will add to a more robust feedback loop and meet the intentions of informal observations for continuous school improvement. The District has also created a set of district-level “focus-walk” tools that are personalized by building. District-level administration and specialists utilize the observational tool to provide feedback to building-level administrators and verify the progress the District is making in Science of Reading and building level “look fors”. The District has created a system of support for their schools by placing them in three tiers of support. Schools in Tier III have more frequent focus-walks and additional supports provided by the district.

Total Mid-Year Points for Criteria Two: 3.7-Satisfactory

Next Steps: The structure for an effective implementation of TESS and LEADS has been set up within the district. District administration needs to continue to monitor and support school administration in supporting teachers with effective and timely feedback to improve instruction. The focus walk tool and tiered support structure the district has set up is reasonable and if used with fluidity has the potential to identify and provide the needed support to school administrators at the right time. Therefore, decreasing the risk of a school falling through the cracks within a large school system.

<p>Criteria 3: The District will implement the district-adopted reading curriculum that incorporates the principles of the SoR and support for Dyslexia. Evidence Folder</p>		
<p>Artifacts: School Level Plans and District Plan of support that outlines the curriculum, resources and PD that aligns with the science of reading and the demonstrated needs of the districts’ students; Data from Focus Walks; Lesson Plans</p>	<p>Presentation Date:</p>	<p>Responsible Party</p>
<p>Evidence- Beginning of Year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SoR training for certified staff occurring as scheduled with minimal disruptions to student learning (<i>Adjusted</i>) 	<p>District Leadership Team: July 2020 DESE: August 2020 PPC: August 2020</p>	<p>Lead: Hope Worsham</p>

<p><i>due to Covid</i>) Making Adequate Progress/3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assessor training for supervisors occurring as scheduled (<i>Adjusted due to Covid</i>) Making Adequate Progress/3 ● SoR Teaching practices occurring in all K-2 classrooms and documented by the focus walk data Making Adequate Progress/3 	<p>CAB: August 2020 LRSD Board Ratification: December 2020 (Work Session)</p>	<p>Support: Stacy Smith, Jeremy Owoh, Kiffany Pride, Randy Rutherford, Darian Smith Resource: Textbook Vendors</p>
<p>Evidence- Mid-Year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Winter NWEA data- testing completed ● Focus walk data Making Adequate Progress/3 ● DESE SoR implementation feedback Making Adequate Progress/3 ● Screening process for students who show a need based on Winter NWEA data 	<p>Due to DESE by February 1, 2021</p>	
<p>Evidence-End-of -Year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Spring NWEA Data ● Focus walk data from DESE about the SoR implementation ● Placement for dyslexia services as appropriate for any student showing a need based on screening. 	<p>Due to DESE by June 1, 2021</p>	
<p>OCSS Comments: Due to COVID-19, the District had some delays in Science of Reading professional development. However, they adjusted and worked with the ADE Literacy unit to reorganize and provide the necessary training. The District has stayed committed to SoR literacy core components and has had to recreate and utilize new digital curriculum available to support literacy instruction for their teachers and students. The District specialists and teachers have created digital literacy units to support the newly adopted literacy materials from last year.</p> <p>At least 50% of teachers have finished a SoR Phase I pathway, while another 30% are currently in a SoR cohort. The District also has at least one administrator from each building in SoR Assessor Academy and are on track to be able to assess in the Spring. Educators who are not in a pathway have been notified and the district is following up with each one to determine next steps.</p> <p>The District continues to improve the level of their dyslexia services and have hired an additional district level dyslexia specialist to support schools.</p> <p>Total Mid-Year Points for Criteria Three: 3.0- Satisfactory</p>		

Next Steps: The District will continue to work with the DESE literacy team as needed to create the needed capacity for the district to meet the needs of their teachers in regards to the Science of Reading. Literacy and dyslexia specialists need to continue to create or identify the digital curriculum needed to support students and teachers.

Criteria 4: An approved budget that is not deficit spending

[Evidence Folder](#)

Artifacts: Budgets, projections	Due Date	Responsible Party
A 3 year budget projection for long term sustainability of the district is developed in consultation with DESE and approved by the local board and Secretary of Education. Not Met	District Leadership Team Approval: August 2020 Presentation to DESE: August 2020 Presentation to PPC: August 2020 Presentation CAB: August/September 2020	Lead: Kelsey Bailey Support: Mike Poore, Greg Rogers, Donna Adkins, Cynthia Smith, Randy Rutherford, Darian Smith
Mid-Year Review of Year 1 Budget that meets criteria- Not Met	Due to DESE by January 2021- Board Packet Review by LRSD Board by January 2021- Done	Resource: Jack Truemper, Stephens
End of Year Review of Year 1 Budget and adjustments for Year 2 identified.	Due to DESE by April 2021	

OCSS Comments: The district budget was created at the beginning of the year based on expenditure and revenues from the previous year, as well as the current COVID situation and decline of enrollment. There is a greater impact on student enrollment in the primary grades by COVID-19 in LRSD.

While presenting the budget to the state, the district did lower projected revenue amounts from tax collection, Pre-K, and ALE in 2020. The beginning of the year budget did show deficit spending in comparison to the previous year. During the presentation, LRSD shared areas of concern and potential reductions that could be considered. the

LRSD has reduced some programs and personnel the past six years, while maintaining a fairly stable, but declining student population. These reductions in the past have primarily been due to lack of property assessment appreciation, loss of desegregation funding, and declining enrollment. These factors have created a need to continue developing feasible plans to reduce the District overall expenditures. In interviews with the executive directors, there was an awareness of overstaffing, duplicative high school programming, and low numbers at several schools in the district.

Total Mid-Year Points for Criteria Three: 1.0- Needs Improvement

Next Steps: DESE will continue to work with LRSD in the spring to create a projected 3 year budget.

Criteria: An approved Master Facility plan

[Evidence Folder](#)

Artifact	Due Date	Responsible Party
Master Facilities Update with funding plan is approved by the local board and Secretary of Education. This will align with any standing Desegregation Settlements and inclusive of Magnet/Specialty Schools. MET/4	District Leadership Team Approval: October 2020 Presentation to DESE: November 2020 Presentation to PPC: November 2020 LRSD Board Ratification: January 2021	Lead: Kevin Yarberry Support: Kelsey Bailey, Tim Cain, Mike Poore, Randy Rutherford, Darian Smith Resource: Jack Truemper, Stephens
End of year review of progress toward implementation of Facility Plan.	Due to DESE by May 2021	

OCSS Comments: The Master facility plan was approved in 2020.

Total Mid-Year Points for Criteria Five: 4.0- Satisfactory

Next Steps: Consideration of the extension of the millage or adjustments to the facilities plan